arXiv:1503.08495v1 [quant-ph] 29 Mar 2015

Bell-Type Inequalities Can Act as a Measure of Entanglement

Chandan Datta,[1, *] Pankaj Agrawal,[1, †] and Sujit K Choudhary[1, ‡]

[1] *Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg, Bhubaneswar-751005, Odisha, India.*

We study local-realistic inequalities, Bell-type inequalities, for finite dimensional quantum systems – qudits. There are a number of proposed Bell inequalities for such systems. Our interest is in relating the value of Bell inequality function with a measure of entanglement. Interestingly, we find that one of these inequalities, Son-Lee-Kim inequality can be used to measure entanglement of a pure bipartite state. We also discuss the experimental feasibility of this measurement.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Hk, 03.67.Bg, 03.67.Mn

In a much celebrated paper, J. S. Bell established that any realistic interpretation of quantum theory is bound to be non local [1]. Bell established this by means of an inequality which is violated by the singlet state of a pair of qubits. Later, a few other states were discovered which also violate this inequality and thus forbid local-realistic description for them. But, all these led to a very natural question – whether this contradiction between quantum theory and local-realism is typical or it is restricted to some very special cases. Answer to this question came in 1991 when Nicolas Gisin [2] showed that any pure entangled state of a bipartite system violates a Bell's inequality and thus are nonlocal. The maximum quantum violation of this inequality is $2\sqrt{2}$. It is known as the Tsirelson's bound [3], which a two-qubit maximally entangled state attains for a particular measurement setting. This leads to another interesting question— is there any relation between violation of Bell's inequality and amount of entanglement? In the case of two-qubit entangled states, it can be shown that for particular measurement settings the Bell-CHSH operator value increases with the entanglement of the state. Is this also the case for two qudit ($d > 2$) entangled state? We answer this question also in affirmative.

Entanglement in higher dimensional systems is important from both fundamental and practical point of view. Higher dimensional entanglement provides important advantages in quantum communication than the conventional qubit entanglement. It provides more security against eavesdropping in cryptography [4], it can be used to increase the channel-capacity via superdense-coding [5] and is more robust against environmental noise [6] than the conventional two-qubit entanglement. However for practical applications of these protocols, experimental preparation and detection of higher dimensional entangled state is of crucial importance. The violation of Bell-type inequalities can detect the presence of entanglement in such systems. Therefore Bell-type inequalities in higher dimensional system have generated much interest in recent years [7–12]. One of the approaches to obtain Bell's inequality in higher dimension employs a projection of multilevel down to dichotomic one [2, 7]. But sometimes it is also important to know whether it enables to probe genuine high-dimensionality or not [8, 9, 13]. In 2002, Collins, Gisin, Linden, Massar, and Popescu introduced [8] an inequality (henceforth will be referred to as CGLMP inequality) which is known to be the only tight inequality [14] for higher dimensional systems. But, this inequality is not maximally violated for a maximally entangled state of such systems [15]. Interestingly, in 2006, Son, Lee and Kim introduced another set of Bell-type inequalities for qudit systems (hereafter, the SLK inequality) [9] which is maximally violated for a maximally entangled state of two-qudit. We show that for a particular measurement setting, the Bell-SLK function (defined below) is zero for product states. Thus a nonzero value of this function immediately suggests that the measured state is entangled. Interestingly, for this setting, the value of the Bell-SLK function increases with the concurrence of the pure bipartite entangled states. Thus, the SLK test can serve as a measure of entanglement for a pure bipartite state. We note that for CGLMP inequality there is no such relation for this setting.

In the SLK test, two far separated observers Alice and Bob, can independently choose one of the two observables denoted by A_1, A_2 for Alice and B_1, B_2 for Bob. Measurement outcomes of the observables are elements of the set, $V = \{1, \omega, \cdots, \omega^{d-1}\}$, where $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/d)$. In a variant of SLK inequality [16], the Bell-SLK function, I_{SLK}, is given by

$$I_{SLK} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{n=1}^{d-1} \Big(\omega^{-n/4} C^n_{1,1} + \omega^{-3n/4} C^n_{2,1} + \omega^{n/4} C^n_{1,2} + \omega^{-n/4} C^n_{2,2} \Big) + c.c., \tag{1}$$

$\omega = exp(2\pi i/d)$, c.c. is for complex conjugate, $C^n_{a,b} = \langle A^n_a B^n_b \rangle$. The assumption of local-realism implies $I_{SLK} \leq I^{\max}_{SLK}(\text{LR})$, where $I^{\max}_{SLK}(\text{LR}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(3\cot\frac{\pi}{4d} - \cot\frac{3\pi}{4d}\Big) - 2\sqrt{2}$ [16]. By using Fourier transformation, we write Bell-SLK function in joint probability space as [16, 17]

$$\begin{aligned} I_{SLK} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} f(\alpha)[&P(A_1 = B_1 + \alpha) \\ &+ P(B_1 = A_2 + \alpha + 1) + P(A_2 = B_2 + \alpha) \\ &+ P(B_2 = A_1 + \alpha)], \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where sums inside the probabilities are modulo d sums, and

$$f(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\cot[\frac{\pi}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})] - 1\Big). \tag{3}$$

We now calculate the value of the Bell-SLK function for an arbitrary pure two-qudit state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i|ii\rangle$ and for the measurement settings originally given in [18]. The nondegenerate eigenvectors of the operators $\hat{A}_a$, $a = 1, 2$, and $\hat{B}_b$, $b = 1, 2$, are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} |k\rangle_{A,a} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{j=0}^{d-1}\omega^{(k+\delta_a)j}|j\rangle, \\ |l\rangle_{B,b} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{j=0}^{d-1}\omega^{(-l+\epsilon_b)j}|j\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\delta_1 = 0, \delta_2 = 1/2, \epsilon_1 = 1/4$ and $\epsilon_2 = -1/4$. The joint probabilities in (2) can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_1 = B_1 + \alpha) &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{p,q=0}^{d-1} c_p c_q \omega^{(\alpha+1/4)(p-q)}, \\ P(B_1 = A_2 + \alpha + 1) &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{p,q=0}^{d-1} c_p c_q \omega^{-(\alpha+1/4)(p-q)}, \\ P(A_2 = B_2 + \alpha) &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{p,q=0}^{d-1} c_p c_q \omega^{(\alpha+1/4)(p-q)}, \\ P(B_2 = A_1 + \alpha) &= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{p,q=0}^{d-1} c_p c_q \omega^{-(\alpha+1/4)(p-q)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Putting these probabilities in (2), we get

$$I_{SLK} = \frac{4}{d}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} f(\alpha) \sum_{p,q=0}^{d-1} c_p c_q \omega^{(\alpha+1/4)(p-q)}. \tag{6}$$

From the identity $\sum_{k=0}^{d-1}(-1)^k\cot(\frac{2k+1}{4d})\pi = d$ [19], we can obtain another identity $\sum_{k=0}^{d-1}\cot(\frac{4k+1}{4d})\pi = d$. Therefore, we get $\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} f(\alpha) = 0$. We can then rewrite (6) as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{SLK} =& \frac{4}{d}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} f(\alpha) \sum_{\substack{p\neq q\\ p>q}} 2c_p c_q \cos\Big(\frac{2\pi}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})(p-q)\Big) \\ =& \frac{4}{d}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\cot[\frac{\pi}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})] - 1\Big) \\ & \sum_{\substack{p\neq q\\ p>q}} 2c_p c_q \cos\Big(\frac{2\pi}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})(p-q)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

To evaluate it further, we now need to find following two sums

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1}\cos\Big(\frac{2\pi m}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})\Big), \tag{8}$$

and

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1}\cos\Big(\frac{2\pi m}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})\Big)\cot\Big(\frac{\pi}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})\Big), \tag{9}$$

where we have replaced $p - q$ by m (an integer).

Using trigonometrical identity in [20], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1}\cos\Big(\frac{2\pi m}{d}(\alpha+\frac{1}{4})\Big) \\ &= \cos\Big(\frac{\pi m}{2d} + \frac{(d-1)\pi m}{d}\Big)\sin\pi m \operatorname{cosec}\frac{\pi m}{d} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

i.e, the first sum (8) is equal to zero.

To calculate the sum (9), we first prove following two theorems.

Theorem 1: With a and k being positive integer such that $a < k$, and $0 < b < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\cos\frac{2\pi a j}{k}\cot(\frac{\pi j}{k} + \pi b) \\ &= k\cos[b(2a-k)\pi]\operatorname{cosec}(bk\pi), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Proof: To obtain the sum, we will use the method of residues. We take the complex function as [21]

$$g_1(z) = \frac{e^{2\pi i a z}\cot(\pi z + \pi b)}{e^{2\pi i k z} - 1} - \frac{e^{-2\pi i a z}\cot(\pi z + \pi b)}{e^{-2\pi i k z} - 1}. \tag{12}$$

Let us now consider the integral $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_C g_1(z)dz$, where C is a contour which is positively oriented indented rectangle with vertices at $\pm iR$ and $1 \pm iR$, with $R > \epsilon$, and with semicircular indentations of radius $\epsilon < b$ to the left of both 0 and 1. Since the period of $g_1(z)$ is 1, the integrals along the intended vertical sides of C cancel. Here we have taken a such that $0 < a < k$. $g_1(z)$ tends to 0 uniformly for $0 \leqslant x \leqslant 1$ as $|y| \to \infty$. Hence, $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_C g_1(z)dz = 0$. We, next, calculate the residue at different poles of $g_1(z)$. g_1 has simple poles at $z = 0$ and $z = j/k, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant k-1$. The corresponding residues can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Res}(g_1, 0) &= \frac{1}{\pi i k}\cot(\pi b), \\ \mathrm{Res}(g_1, j/k) &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{1}{\pi i k}\cos\frac{2\pi a j}{k}\cot(\frac{\pi j}{k} + \pi b). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

There is another pole inside the contour – simple pole at $z = -b + 1$. The residue at this point is

$$\mathrm{Res}(g_1, -b+1) = \frac{i}{\pi}\cos[b(2a-k)\pi]\operatorname{cosec}(bk\pi). \tag{14}$$

As the integral is zero, the sum of the residues must be zero. We, thus, get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \cos\frac{2\pi a j}{k} \cot\left(\frac{\pi j}{k} + \pi b\right) \\ = k\cos\left[b(2a-k)\pi\right] \operatorname{cosec}(bk\pi). \tag{15}$$

This completes the proof [22].

Theorem 2: With a and k being positive integer such that $a < k$, and $0 < b < 1$.

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sin\frac{2\pi a j}{k} \cot\left(\frac{\pi j}{k} + \pi b\right) \\ = -k\sin\left[b(2a-k)\pi\right] \operatorname{cosec}(bk\pi). \tag{16}$$

Proof: For this theorem, steps are similar to the theorem 1. We now consider the complex function

$$g_2(z) = \frac{e^{2\pi i a z}\cot(\pi z + \pi b)}{e^{2\pi i k z} - 1} + \frac{e^{-2\pi i a z}\cot(\pi z + \pi b)}{e^{-2\pi i k z} - 1}. \tag{17}$$

Taking the same contour as in the previous case and noticing that $\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_C g_2(z)dz = 0$, we get (by the residue theorem)

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sin\frac{2\pi a j}{k} \cot\left(\frac{\pi j}{k} + \pi b\right) \\ = -k\sin\left[b(2a-k)\pi\right] \operatorname{cosec}(bk\pi). \tag{18}$$

This completes the proof [22].

Using Theorems 1 and 2, we can easily see,

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-1} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi m}{d}(\alpha + \frac{1}{4})\right) \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{d}(\alpha + \frac{1}{4})\right) = d. \tag{19}$$

Eqs. (3), (7), (10) and (19) together imply

$$I_{SLK} = 4\sqrt{2}\sum_{\substack{p\neq q\\ p>q}} c_p c_q. \tag{20}$$

This sum is proportional to the concurrence of the state. The concurrence, $\mathbb{C}$, for a two-qudit pure state is defined as [23]

$$\mathbb{C} = \sum_{\substack{p\neq q\\ p>q}} c_p c_q \frac{2}{d-1}. \tag{21}$$

This is a generalization of the concurrence for a system of two qubits [24]. Using this we finally get

$$I_{SLK} = 2\sqrt{2}(d-1)\mathbb{C}. \tag{22}$$

Thus, we obtain an interesting relation between concurrence and the value of Bell-SLK function for a particular measurement setting. Value of this function is zero for product states (and hence also for separable states) whereas it increases linearly with the concurrence for pure entangled states. This may give a way to measure the entanglement of a pure entangled state. The entanglement can be inferred by measuring the Bell-SLK function for the state for the above, given in (4), measurement setting. In $d = 2$, the SLK inequality reduces to familiar CHSH [25] inequality, so this relation holds for CHSH inequality also. The relation we have obtained holds for a specific measurement settings. As is known, the choice of measurement setting is important. There are measurement settings, for which even maximally entangled state may not violate an inequality. Furthermore, (22) does not give optimal value of the Bell-SLK function [26].

Interestingly, this test can be performed in laboratories with the present day's technology. State of a qudit is encoded in the orbital angular momentum (OAM) states of photons [27]. Higher dimensional bipartite entanglement is generated through spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) [10, 28]. In [10], Dada et al. have employed the same measurement setting as in Eq. (4) to reveal the presence of entanglement for bipartite qudit systems having dimensions up to twelve [10]. They have obtained violation of CGLMP inequality experimentally for higher dimensional entangled systems. Though violation of this inequality can detect the presence of entanglement, but this violation cannot be used to measure the amount of entanglement present in the bipartite state, at least, for the employed setting. This is because, for the said setting, it is not maximally violated for a maximally entangled state of two-qudits [15]. It would be interesting to look for another measurement setting which gives a relation between amount of entanglement and the Bell function for CGLMP inequality. On the other hand, though SLK test can measure the entanglement, but this inequality gets violated only for $\mathbb{C} > I_{SLK}^{\max}(\mathrm{LR})/2\sqrt{2}(d-1)$, i.e. not every pure entangled state violates it. For example, for $d = 2$, CHSH inequality will be violated only when $\mathbb{C} > 1\sqrt{2}$ for the above said measurement settings.

In conclusion, we have argued that higher dimensional entanglement is important both from fundamental and practical point of view. For higher dimensional systems there are many local-realistic inequalities in literature. We have studied SLK inequality and have found that the SLK test can be useful for measuring entanglement of such systems. Looking for a local realistic inequality which is both tight and also violated maximally for maximally entangled state would be an interesting future work.

Acknowledgment: S.K.C. acknowledges support from the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Government of India (Scientists' Pool Scheme).

---

[*] chandan@iopb.res.in

[†] agrawal@iopb.res.in

[‡] sujit@iopb.res.in

- [1] J. S. Bell *Physics* **1** 195 (1964); J. S. Bell *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38** 447 (1966).
- [2] N. Gisin *Phys. Lett. A* **154** 201 (1991).
- [3] B. S. Tsirelson *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4** 93 (1980).
- [4] T. Durt, D. Kaszlikowski, J. L. Chen and L. C. Kwek *Phys. Rev. A* **69** 032313 (2004); T. Durt, N. J. Cerf, N. Gisin and M. Zukowski *Phys. Rev. A* **67** 012311 (2003); D. Bruss and C. Macchiavello *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** 127901 (2002); H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci and A. Peres *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** 3313 (2000).
- [5] W. Chuan, F.-G. Deng, Y.-S. Liu and G. L. Long *Phys. Rev. A* **71** 044305 (2005).
- [6] M. L. Almeida, S. Pironio, J. Barrett, G. Toth, and A. Acin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 040403 (2007); L. Sheridan and V. Scarani *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 030301 (2010).
- [7] N. Gisin and A. Peres *Phys. Lett. A* **162** 15 (1992).
- [8] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** 040404 (2002).
- [9] W. Son, J. Lee and M. S. Kim *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 060406 (2006).
- [10] A. C. Dada, J. Leach, G. S. Buller, M. J. Padgett and E. Andersson *Nature Physics* **7** 677 (2011).
- [11] C. Bernhard, B. Bessire, A. Montina, M. Pfaffhauser, A. Stefanov and S. Wolf *J. Phys A: Math. Theor.* **47** 424013 (15pp) (2014).
- [12] J.-L. Chen, D.-L. Deng, and M.-G. Hu, *Phys. Rev. A* **77** 060306(R) (2008).
- [13] N. J. Cerf, S. Massar and S. Pironio *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 080402 (2002).
- [14] L. Masanes, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* Vol. **3**, No. 4, 345 (2002).
- [15] A. Acin, T. Durt, N. Gisin and J. I. Latorre *Phys. Rev. A* **65** 052325 (2002).
- [16] S.-W. Lee, J. Ryu, and J. Lee *Journal of the Korean Physical Society*, Vol. **48** No. 6, 1307 (2006).
- [17] S.-W. Lee, Y. W. Cheong, and J. Lee, *Phys. Rev. A* **76** 032108 (2007).
- [18] T. Durt, D. Kaszlikowski, and M. Zukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** 024101 (2001).
- [19] H. A. Hassan, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **339**, 811 (2008).
- [20] I. S. Gradshteyn, and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of integrals, series, and products.* 7th ed. Academic Press, page 36.
- [21] B.C. Berndt and B. P. Yeap, *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **29** 358 (2002).
- [22] The proof of the theorem can be extened for any nonintegral real value of b. The same result will hold.
- [23] P. Rungta, V. Buzek, C. M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** 042315 (2001).
- [24] W. K. Wooters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 2245 (1997).
- [25] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** 880 (1969).
- [26] For $d = 2$, the optimal value of the Bell-CHSH function is $2\sqrt{1+\mathbb{C}^2}$.
- [27] A.Vaziri, G.Weihs, and A. Zeilinger J. *Opt. B Quantum Semiclassical Opt.* Vol. **4**, 47 (2002).
- [28] A. Mair, A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* (London) 412, 313 (2001).